

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No. 09/721,609	Applicant(s) BRONSHTEIN ET AL.	
	Examiner Krisanne Jastrzab (formerly Thornton)	Art Unit 1744	

All Participants:

(1) Krisanne Jastrzab (formerly Thornton).

(2) Atty Michael Weslowski.
Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 22 April 2004
Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.
Rejection(s) discussed:
Rejection over Bronshtein and two Double Pat. rejections
Claims discussed:

46-71

Prior art documents discussed:

5,766,520

Part II.
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet
Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner contacted Mr. Weslowski to attempt to put the case in condition for allowance. She indicated that the art rejection would be maintained for claims 70-71 because they did not include the limitation of methylated monosaccharides and that the double patenting rejections would be maintained for those claims not limited by the percentage ranges of mixture elements. The Examiner indicated that the application would be passed to issue if Applicant submitted appropriate Terminal Disclaimers or canceled those claims, and with cancelation of claims 70-71. Mr. Weslowski indicated that he would need to discuss those changes with his client and that the Examiner should proceed with mailing of a final rejection reflecting that set forth above..